



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/298,726	04/23/1999	VALTER MADDALON	06023-71(MI/	2377

570 7590 04/10/2002

AKIN, GUMP, STRAUSS, HAUER & FELD, L.L.P.
ONE COMMERCE SQUARE
2005 MARKET STREET, SUITE 2200
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

EXAMINER

DEXTER, CLARK F

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3724

DATE MAILED: 04/10/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/298,726

Applicant(s)

Maddalon

Examiner

Clark F. Dexter

Art Unit

3724



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jan 15, 2002

2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, and 8 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, and 8 is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13) ☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:

1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____

3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

15) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____

16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____

20) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 3724

DETAILED ACTION

Request for Continued Examination

1. The Request for Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.114 filed on January 15, 2002 is acceptable and an RCE has been established. An action on the RCE follows.
2. The after-final amendment filed September 21, 2001 has now been entered. It is noted that in view of the new amendment practice under 37 CFR 1.121 which became mandatory for all amendments on March 1, 2001, and due to the limited amount of examining time per application, if the amendment contains changes to existing language that requires a marked-up version showing those changes, the Examiner is relying upon the marked-up version(s) for examination of the application. It is applicant's responsibility to ensure that the clean version(s) is (are) the same as the marked-up version(s). It is further noted that the clean version(s) is (are) considered to be the Official version(s).

Claim Objections

3. Claims 1, 2 and 8 are objected to because of the following informalities: in claim 1, line 18, "microprocessor" is misspelled. Appropriate correction is required.

Art Unit: 3724

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 2 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roy et al., pn 5,586,479.

Roy et al. discloses a cutting device with almost every structural limitation of the claimed invention including a first pair of rollers (e.g., 56, 62) which are coupled and thus driven together by a first motor; a cutting assembly (e.g., 60) which is driven by a second motor; a third motor (e.g., 84) pivoting one of the cutting assembly and the pair of rollers; a reading system having first (e.g., 58A) and second (e.g., 58B) spaced apart optical sensors; and a microprocessor (e.g., 30) which "recognizes" marks on the work piece.

Roy et al. lacks the microprocessor having stored therein a preset sequence of marks corresponding to the feature of the boundary marks, specifically the preset sequence of white and black lines oriented at right angles to the work piece feed direction. However, the Examiner takes Official notice that such marking is old and well known in the art for various known benefits including providing automatic triggering of various different operations during a processing of a workpiece. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to

Art Unit: 3724

provide markings on a workpiece and to program the microprocessor of Roy et al. to read such markings for the various known benefits including that described above.

It is noted that if it is argued that Roy et al. does not explicitly disclose a first motor and a second motor, the Examiner takes Official notice that such a configuration is old and well known in the art for various known benefits including providing separate control to individual components as desired. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide a first and second motor for the well known benefits including that described above.


Regarding claim 8, Roy et al. lacks the cutting assembly having first and second parallel spaced apart blades. However, the Examiner takes Official notice that such a cutter configuration is old and well known in the art and provides various well known benefits including facilitating the making of two parallel cuts simultaneously for various well known benefits including cutting strips with parallel borders. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide first and second parallel spaced apart blades for the well known benefits including that described above.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Clark Dexter whose telephone number is (703) 308-1404. The examiner's typical work schedule is Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday, and he can be reached during normal business hours on these days.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Allan Shoap, can be reached at (703)308-1082.

Art Unit: 3724

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-1148. The fax numbers for this group are: formal papers - (703)305-3579; informal/draft papers - (703)305-9835.



Clark F. Dexter
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3724

cfd
April 8, 2002